

Appl. No. 10/651,846
Amdt. dated January 12, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of December 27, 2005

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks. After the amendments detailed above, claims 5, 6, 8, 12, 13 and 16-19 are pending in this application. In particular, claims 5, 6 and 12 have been amended, claims 1-4, 7, 9-11 and 14-15 have been canceled and claims 8 and 13 have been maintained in their previous form. New claims 16-19 have been added.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 11

The Examiner has rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is moot as claim 11 has been canceled.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4 and 14

Claims 1, 4 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,522,044 to Pascucci et al. Applicant has canceled these claims, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 9-11 and 15

Claims 9-11 and 15 were also rejected as being unpatentable over Pascucci et al. Applicant has canceled these claims, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 12 and 13

Claims 12 and 13 were also rejected as being unpatentable over Pascucci et al. Applicant has amended independent claim 12 to be consistent with the Examiner's statement of allowable subject matter on page 7 of the Final Office Action, in particular, Applicant has amended claim 12 to recite: "A system for facilities management, including: a server; a client coupled with the server; and a personality module coupled with the server..." Applicant believes that the amended independent claim 12 is patentably distinguishable from Pascucci et al., and therefore, the rejection to this claim should be withdrawn. Since claim 13 depends from and further limits claim 12, the rejection to this claim should also be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/651,846
Amdt. dated January 12, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of December 27, 2005

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6, 8 and 18

The Examiner has indicated that claims 6 and 8 are allowable over prior art. Accordingly, Applicant has maintained the claims in their previous form and, therefore, these claims should be allowed. Applicant has also added a new dependent claim 18 that depends from and further limits claim 6, and therefore, this claim should also be allowed.

Claims 5, 16 and 17

The Examiner has indicated that claim 5 would be allowable over prior art if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 5 into independent form and, therefore, this claim should be allowed. In addition, Applicant has added dependent claims 16 and 17 to depend from and further limit claim 5, and therefore, these claims should also be allowed.

Claim 19

As discussed above, amended independent claim 12 should be allowable over prior art. Since new dependent claim 19 depends from and further limits claim 12, this claim should also be allowed.

IV. Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and, accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Should any questions remain regarding the allowability of the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Greenberg Traurig
3773 Howard Hughes Pkwy.
Suite 500 North
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

Telephone : 702-792-3773
Facsimile : 702 792-9002

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Rob L. Phillips
Registration No. 40,305

Date: January 12, 2006